

concerned in the struggle. He judged European politics purely from the standpoint of a nineteenth-century Englishman.

For these reasons every student of the reigns of James II and William III is obliged to seek an account of their foreign policy in the pages of other historians. There are many monographs by foreign writers dealing with particular parts of the subject* though few Englishmen have done anything to elucidate it. There are also some general histories of the period. Onno Klopp's *Fall of the House of Stuart*¹ contains a detailed exposition of the negotiations and diplomatic intrigues of the time, based on English as well as foreign archives. But the best introduction to the subject is Leopold von Ranke's *History of England*,² and it is also the best corrective of Macaulay.

It has been well said that Ranke would scarcely have devoted over a volume to the period treated by Macaulay, merely to add a little new information here and there or correct some errors in the details. He must have believed that there were faults in Macaulay's representation of events which made it worth while to tell the story over again. There is a closer connection between the two works than a casual reader suspects. Though Ranke hardly ever mentions Macaulay, there are many indirect references to his book. Sometimes they are unmistakable. For

instance, in
commenting upon the attacks of James 11 on
the constitution Ranke says: * We do not consider ourselves
authorised
to adopt the tone which English historians
have borrowed

¹Vols. iii and iv deal with the reign of James ; vols. v-ix
with that of
William. Klopp is as strongly pro-Austrian as Macaulay
is the opposite.

²Englische Geschichte, vom sechzehnten
und siebzehnten
Jahrhundert (7 vols.; 1859-68), The English
translation in six volumes
was published at Oxford in 1875. It is divided into 22
books, of which
books xvii to xxi deal with the reigns of James and
William.